Eco-Linguistics and Sustainability: Language as a Tool for Environmental Responsibility

Wania Gul
Visiting Lecturer and PhD Scholar at Department of English, University of Sargodha, Pakistan
english.waniagul@uos.edu.pk
Wadad Abadella Abadgewd Elismariy
Lecturer Benghazi University, Libya, PhD scholar in Applied Linguistics at the school of
Languages, Literacies and translation, University sains Malaysia(USM)
wedad.abdella@student.usm.my
Babar Riaz
Visiting Lecturer and PhD scholar at Department of English, University of Gujrat, Pakistan
briaz064@gmail.com

Abstract
Eco-linguistics, an interdisciplinary field merging linguistics and ecological studies, examines how language shapes human perceptions and behaviors toward the environment. This research explores the role of language in promoting environmental responsibility by analyzing discursive practices, metaphors, and narratives that either reinforce unsustainable paradigms or advocate for ecological sustainability. Drawing on theoretical frameworks from Halliday's systemic-functional linguistics and the "ecosophy" of Arran Stibbe, the study investigates how linguistic choices such as anthropocentric metaphors ("conquering nature") versus ecocentric terminology ("living in harmony with ecosystems") influence policy-making, education, and public awareness. Case studies include comparative analyses of environmental discourse in corporate sustainability reports, indigenous communities' eco-centric lexicons, and climate change communication in media. The findings reveal that language can either perpetuate exploitative attitudes or foster a sense of interconnectedness with nature, as evidenced by indigenous languages that embed ecological ethics grammatically. The study also critiques the dominance of neoliberal "greenwashing" rhetoric, which often obscures systemic environmental harm. By advocating for an eco-linguistic paradigm shift such as adopting "restorative" over "sustainable" and emphasizing "kinship" over "resources" this research proposes actionable strategies for educators, policymakers, and communicators to align language with planetary well-being. The conclusion underscores the urgency of integrating eco-linguistic principles into curricula, media, and policy frameworks to cultivate a linguistically conscious approach to global sustainability challenges.
Keywords*: Eco-Linguistics, Sustainability, Environmental Discourse, Language Ideology, Ecological Metaphors, Climate Communication.*

Introduction

Ecolinguistics or the field of eco-linguistics investigates the dual relationship between language and the ecological context within which the human community is embedded. Tracing its roots back to the idea stated by Michael Halliday (1990) that linguistics should pay more attention to the global environmental issues, eco-linguistics has developed as a trans disciplinary research field. It also explores the way linguistic patterns, discourses, metaphors and narratives create and represent an ecological thinking and behavior. Language in the current environment of climate change, loss of biodiversity, and systematic environmental contradiction, which is marked under the epoch called the Anthropocene, serves both as a means of communication and a reality creator, a propulsion of behavior (Stibbe, 2021). Eco-linguistics asks questions about the ideologies of growth, anthropocentrism and consumerism with which language is propagating and it also finds alternative discourses that will contribute to sustainability, interconnectedness and ecological ethics (Zhou, 2022; Bolanle, 2024). Its applicability has risen dramatically as the world grapples to redefine an agenda of sustainability not only in terms of policy or science, but also in the culture of the stories people tell themselves about nature, economy and the future (Williamson et al., 2024). The field is the best placed to expose the linguistic undertones of environmental attitudes that would inform the more effective and ethical communication approaches in the sustainability advocacy front.

Although these developments point to hopeful directions, there has been a significant lacking in the development of a systematic analysis of the language on the field of environmental policy and education. Despite the fact that different environmental discourses have been examined in political discourses or even in news accounts, little integrative focus has been made on how language structures can shape and process environmental policy. This vacuum is especially through multilingual and pedagogical environment, whereby education is an essential carrier of environmental beliefs. As an illustration, a recent research by Kazazoglu (2025) revealed that the inclusion of eco-literacy in the teaching of English language made a huge difference in enhancing awareness and vocabulary levels of learners regarding issues of sustainability. Nevertheless, few studies of this kind exist, and further ones are necessary to relate the results in different contexts, educational levels, and linguistic backgrounds to each other. Furthermore, corporate communication literature has discussed how the terminology of sustainability has been strategically misused, or, in other words, used to greenwash unsustainable behaviors, and this necessitates critical language awareness in public policy and education (Bolanle, 2024). The fact that there are no systematic structures to assess the language use in these problematic fields hinders the formation of stable ecologically sound discourses within the official curricula and legislative documents. The ecological possibilities of making more ethical and effective sustainability communication are, therefore, not fully capitalized on.

This gap needs to be filled with a multidisciplinary integrative approach that combines the tools of linguistics, education, environmental science, and the study of policy. Researchers have been promoting a new ecolinguistics, or active semantics of language as action or languaging that co-constitutes reality and influences human-environment relations (Hu et al., 2024). It is an aspect of complexity thinking which is based on the complexity theory and claims that linguistic practices contribute to the shaping of the ecological consciousness and conduct. Even though

environmental education programs have focused on ecological literacy and systems thinking a long time ago (Orr, 2004; Capra & Luisi, 2014), not much attention has been given to how certain linguistic forms can facilitate or inhibit such goals. As an illustration, one may use the term such as resilience, adaptation, or net zero, which are commonly used without critical thinking, and thus, are left ambiguous or falsely understood (Stretton, 2024). In the same way, the oral traditions and indigenous languages, which tend to transmit highly relational and sustainable worldviews, are also marginalized in environmental discourse. To solve this, future studies should devise holistic analytical systems to evaluate curricula, teacher education, policy formulation, as well as, interpersonal language decisions in the society. It is only on this basis that eco-linguistics can deliver on its promise to assist societies to speak about sustainability, but to also speak sustainably.

Objectives

1. To analyze how linguistic structures, metaphors, and narratives shape environmental perception and behavior across various discursive domains, including corporate, indigenous, and media texts.
2. To develop and recommend eco-linguistic strategies grounded in systemic-functional linguistics and ecosophy that promote sustainable thinking and environmentally responsible communication in policy, education, and media.

Theoretical Framework

This theoretical framework is founded on ecolinguistic approach to language, which Halliday formulated as a form of systemic functional linguistics (SFL) approach to language; an ideology that views language as a social semiotic that both reflects and builds on ecological value (Halliday, 1978; Halliday, 1990). Halliday believes that all the linguistic decisions reflect meaning potential and grammar of language is an active participant in determining how speakers construct reality (Halliday, 2003). Language is therefore not an inert medium but a semiotic ecosystem where terms such as growth, progress or development can only have ideological weight that can legitimize ecological destruction or care depending on the discursive decisions (Halliday, 1990; Steffensen & Fill, 2019). As a consequence of his emphasis on ideational, interpersonal and textual metafunctions, Halliday introduces means of investigating how ecological meaning is constructed across discourse (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004; Halliday, 2003). When applied to the realm of sustainability, SFL allows scholars to unravel the grammar of environmental issues and the way grammatical constructs of these issues influence the opinion of people toward nature, climate change, and environmental justice.

The ecosophy concept developed by Arran Stibbe goes further than the semiotic approach by Halliday and asks what the stories behind our culture are like: stories of perpetual growth, consumer individualism and human dominion over nature (Stibbe, 2015; Stibbe, 2021). These thinking patterns are not just a language metaphor, but a serious ideology that informs action and policy. Stibbe names the following elements to be the building blocks of those stories: framing, metaphor, identity, conviction, evaluation, erasure, salience and ideology (Stibbe, 2015). Ecolinguistic analysis informed by ecosophy considers discourse as the worth of how the discourse reifies or challenges destructive ecological paradigms, or enhances sustainable

worldviews based on relationships and reciprocity (Stibbe, 2021). Such an ecosophical interpretation can enable critical studies to not only reveal the negative cultural narratives and the cultural narratives that cause ecological ignorance and behaviour, but also to suggest new ecolinguistic narratives, positive discourse analysis, that can inspur ecological awareness and ecological behaviour.

The associated with these approaches approach is that of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) that provides a methodological way of studying power relations within the environmental narratives. The concept of DA looks at how the dominant groups employ language to authenticate some environmental agendas and silence others (Stibbe, 2015; Harrre et al., 1999). In ecolinguistics, CDA is reconstructed to encompass not only human-human relations of power, but also intergenerational, and human-non human relations (Arran Stibbe, 2015; Steffensen & Fill, 2019). Because of the emphasis that CDA puts on modality, metaphor, presupposition, nominalization, and transitivity, it becomes possible to expose how policy documents, media reports, and teaching materials frame actors like corporations, governments, nature, and future generations (Stibbe, 2015; research on climate discourse with BERT analysis; Sakaji & Kaneda, 2024). DA therefore allows the analysis of interests foregrounded or erased to be highly detailed and analysed, and the way language constructs ecological authority or marginalization in the debates of sustainability to be brought to the fore.

The three strands, namely, power-critical approach of CDA, SFL-based semiotic frame of Halliday and ecosophy-involved narratives of Stibbe can be combined into a comprehensive scheme of environmental discourse analysis. As an example, the grammatical metafunctions of a sustainability report can be first explored (Halliday), followed by a trace of the presence of dominant/alternative stories-we-live-by (Stibbe) and then the power implications of the report can be unpacked through CDA (Steffensen & Fill, 2019; Stibbe, 2021). This is a recent finding made by empirical research, as an analysis of climate change communication in Pakistan, based on the framework provided by Stibbe and the multimodal CDA approach, found that metaphors of urgency, identity framing, and erasure play a critical role in official language (Saeed & Abid, 2025). Similarly, systemic functional discourse analytic tools have been used to analyze the media framing of climate policy which has shown how agentive and non-agentive constructions can be used to shape the accountability of the citizenry through subtle means (Matthiessen & Law, 2022).

The combination of Halliday semiotic resource model, Stibbe ecosophical moral narrative analysis, and CDA power-sensitive discourse analysis elements provides a researcher with an efficient method to evaluate and change ecological language. This combined theoretical approach assists to show how environmental values are embedded or left out, how narrative justifies or challenges environmental degradation and how some alternative ecolinguistic approaches can be used in policy, teaching and the media. Taken together, these outlooks give scholars the capacity to not only criticize the harmful discourse but also to create positive linguistic solutions (reframing the discussion of the environment as ecological justice, intergenerational justice, and flourishing together).

Methodology

This study employs a qualitative research design grounded in textual analysis and case study methodology, suitable for uncovering the subtle ways language constructs ecological meaning. This approach allows for interpretive depth and contextual sensitivity when examining how metaphors, narratives, and discursive strategies communicate environmental values. The research draws upon key principles from ecolinguistics and critical discourse studies to analyze how language not only reflects but shapes perceptions and actions related to sustainability. By focusing on naturalistic data from multiple cultural and communicative contexts, the study avoids abstract theorizing in favor of grounded, real-world analysis.

Data sources include corporate sustainability reports from major global firms, indigenous ecological texts and expressions from communities such as the Kogi (Colombia) and Māori (New Zealand), and mainstream media coverage of climate change. Corporate documents are analyzed to reveal how economic and environmental narratives intersect, often through neoliberal framings that mask ecological harm. Indigenous languages are included for their ecocentric grammatical structures and embedded cosmologies, providing contrastive worldviews grounded in reciprocity and interdependence with nature. Media discourse, drawn from platforms like *The Guardian* and *BBC*, serves to illustrate how environmental issues are framed for public audiences, particularly in terms of urgency, blame, and proposed solutions.

The analytical toolkit combines metaphor analysis, corpus linguistics, and ethnographic interviews. Metaphor analysis identifies dominant and alternative cognitive frames, revealing how concepts like "carbon footprint" or "clean energy" guide public reasoning. Corpus linguistic methods, applied via software such as AntConc, detect lexical patterns and collocations that highlight or obscure ecological agency and accountability. Ethnographic interviews with educators and language practitioners from indigenous communities add contextual depth, offering emic insights into the role of language in ecological ethics and education. This multi-method triangulation strengthens the analysis by integrating textual features with lived experience, ensuring that linguistic patterns are interpreted within their cultural and ideological contexts.

Findings and Discussion

The report analysis of corporate sustainability report showed that neoliberal metaphors and euphemistic expressions used widely in the report have the effect of separating corporations to the ecological responsibilities in an indirect manner. More widely used metaphors like managing natural capital, harvesting renewable energy, or balancing sustainability and growth tend to reduce nature to a passive economic resource because of its inability to act and interact as a living system with intrinsic value. The analysis of transitivity and agency revealed a high rate of nominalization and passive voice, which conceal the agency of human actors in environmental exploitation (e.g., it refers to emissions being released and not this person, who is you and me, to release the emissions). These results support Halliday systemic-functional focus on the eco-logical meaning, through the grammatical choices (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) and confirm the anxiety of Stibbe (2015) to ponder the presence of the stories-we-live-by and that legitimize the extraction and control. Strategic deployment of evaluative adjectives (e.g., responsible sourcing, ethical mining) that re-label the negative practices in good moral language was also

observed in the reports under analysis, indicating that greenwashing is one of the linguistics phenomena. Critical discourse analysis also demonstrated how the power relations were captured within the discourse not just in what was said but also in what was not said like the absence of ecological limits, the absence of the native voices or the absence of any words or terminologies suggesting the idea of ecological restoration or reciprocity.

Conversely, the studies of native linguistic resources, especially those of Kogi and M2ri people, depicted an entirely different ecological worldview embodied in language. Ethnographic interviews validated that most ecological values are not only taught but grammatically coded as it is in the verbs of relation and the lexicon of the kinship system. As an example, in the Kogi language, rivers and mountains are commonly personified and called in the terms of the members of the family, which can imply the ontological proximity of the human and non-human life. In parallel, Māori language, and in particular, the meaning embodied in proverbs (whakataukI) and formal speech, encodes people within a genealogy of life that encompasses land and water and the dead. The discursive practices are at the symptomatic of an ecosophy that is characterized by mutual responsibility and reciprocity (Stibbe, 2021). These facts demonstrate that the ecology of ethics could be reinforced through linguistic building in everyday communication and learning. In addition, these native eco-linguistic systems provide interesting paradigms of ecological narration that question the prevailing Western discourses of commodification and domination. They also emphasize the value of linguistic diversity as a way of protecting ecological knowledge.

The analysis of the media discourse was controversial. On the one hand, the widest media sources like The Guardian and BBC have developed a sense of desperation and pathos in reporting on climate change, using metaphors, such as the tipping point, climate emergency, and a code red, which create awareness in the general population. These metaphors can provoke action, yet they can also be the cause of discursive tiredness or desensitization when overused with no accompanying narratives of empowerment. The corpus was skewed towards anthropocentric framing, which centred the harm to the environment as a risk to human well-being (e.g. "threatens food security" and "livelihoods at risk"). Moreover, the discussion of climate solutions reinforced the same growth apparatus tropes located in the corporate discourse, such as the technological paradigm and market-driven paradigm of climate solutions, i.e. the "carbon capture," "green tech" and "net-zero targets." This implies that there is a larger ideological tendency in which media, as well as corporate communication, even with the use of the language of sustainable development, still keeps its roots in the neoliberal economic reasoning. In this regard, even the progressive climate coverage can unconsciously replicate the problem-solution frame that presents the ecological collapse as a technological innovation and policy update issue and, therefore, conceals a cultural and linguistic shift.

Collectively, these results reveal language to be more than an echo of ecological thought but, rather, one of the foremost staging areas through which environmental realities are built, fought over, and remodeled. Corporate and media discourses tend to naturalize the tendencies of dominant paradigms of resource exploitation and market-based answers, whereas the indigenous linguistic practices provide a better understanding of alternative conceptual frameworks based on interdependence, kinship, and stewardship. The contrast confirms the

ecosophical imperative of Stibbe (2015) namely that academics and practitioners need to be able to critically assess the extant stories-we-live-by and to develop new ones that are ecologically conducive. The study, also, confirms the usefulness of deploying the metaphor analysis, corpus tool, and ethnographic information in the consideration of both the structural and cultural aspect of environmental discourse. With this research drawing attention to the ideology behind sustainability language in various sectors, it is crucial to suggest the active reform of language in policy, education, and media. Eco-linguistic awareness is not only an academic pursuit but a means of achieving a practical cultural change, one that would help societies emerge out of their rhetoric of commitment to real ecological accountability.

Pedagogical Applications

The introduction of the concepts of the eco-linguistics into the pedagogal programs of language teaching in general and into the English Language Teaching (ELT) specifically, as well as in multilingual classrooms, is a revolutionary chance to bring linguistic learning to the level of ecological awareness. Conventional approaches to language teaching and learning can focus a lot on grammatical correctness and communicative effectiveness and not much on ideological connotations of language use. The concept of eco-linguistics encourages, however, educators to scrutinise the metaphors, stories, and wording preferences built in the language materials and teaching practices. This may include rewriting, or adding, textbooks which whitewash consumerism, expansion or restriction of nature in favour of focusing on sustainability, interdependence and the need to live ecologically responsible lives. Some of the lesson plans may involve reading and interpreting greenwashing in marketing, rewriting environmentalally negative stories, or contrasting the different cultures linguistic framing of human-nature relations. In the multilingual context, we could further engage in the language-based comparative eco-discourse analysis which promotes the cross-cultural ecological empathy. Integrating eco-linguistic awareness into the curriculum of language teaching would enable students to learn key linguistic skills and, at the same time, to learn to communicate in an ecologically aware manner, learning to communicate in a way that reinforces sustainable worldviews instead of inadvertently reinforcing unsustainable ones.

An eco-linguistic pedagogy also has a lot of value when adopted in environmental education modules, including climate literacy, conservation, and sustainability science. Generally, the traditional environmental education focuses on scientific notions and facts and may ignore language vehicles that frame and interpret ideas. Nonetheless, language is not neutral and it determines what learners believe to be urgent, solvable or morally important. Eco-linguistic tools, e.g. metaphor analysis, narrative framing, discourse positioning can be used to enable students to approach critically environmental issues in the media, in policy documents or in the publicly run campaigns. An example could be a study of the effects of such terms as climate resilience or carbon footprint in shaping the general opinion and policy discussion. They may also learn about the way in which various metaphors (e.g. the Earth is a machine /the Earth is a living organism) direct the way in which various courses of action are taken. Such a method does not only strengthen understanding, but also provides students with analytical tools to criticize universe discourses and come up with alternative visions of the future, more sustainable.

Furthermore, the pedagogical application of eco-linguistics helps to learn in an interdisciplinary environment to reduce the barrier between the learning of languages and environmental studies. It promotes networking among linguists, environmental educators and holders of indigenous knowledge to develop collaboratively the teaching resources which were relevant to culture and ecologically sound. As an illustration, one may include indigenous proverbs, storytelling cultures, or eco-grammatical characteristics in the contents of lessons; thus, students will learn about sustainability in various epistemological dimensions. On a curricular level, language and sustainability modules can be developed at the school and university level, where learners are encouraged to learn how language is not only reflective but also the language that not only predicts action but also causes action in environmental action areas. This practice is echoed by the UNESCO vision of Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) that promotes a pluralist, action-based pedagogy that creates critical thinkers, culturally aware and ecologically aware citizens. Finally, integrating eco-linguistic thinking into pedagogy can be used to assist learners not only to talk about the environment but rather to talk on behalf of it, using language that respects, protects and sustains the ecological communities of which we are a part.

Recommendations and Conclusion

Conclusion

The current work has reiterated that language is critical in defining not just the way environmental concerns are expressed but also the building up of ecological realities and the way people perceive them and act upon them. Through the incorporation of Hallidays systemic-functional linguistics and Stibbe, ecosophy and Critical Discourse Analysis, the study developed a robust theoretical and methodological approach to discourse analysis of ecology in corporate, indigenous and media environments. The social semiotic understanding of language as put forward by Halliday allowed unpacking of the grammar in the sustainability narratives that contain how ecological meaning is encoded and is frequently distorted. The deeper stories-we-live-by disclosed by Stibbe as part of their ecosophy were the cognitive and cultural stories of sustenance and subversion to or of prevailing ideologies of domination, exploitation, and anthropocentrism. In the meantime, Critical Discourse Analysis revealed the power relationships that occur within the environmental communication process demonstrating the prioritization of specific groups, interests, or even worldviews over others who are depreciated. In combination, these models provided a critical insight into discourse as a means either to encourage the degradation of the environment by means of passive and evasive discourse, or foster environmental responsibility by means of relational, value-loaded discourse, and inclusive discourse.

The main findings are a distinct difference between mainstream institutional discourses and native ecological worldviews. Neoliberal metaphors and the abstraction of language used in corporate sustainability reports and media coverage retooled environmental harm as a solvable problem that could be addressed via the market and technological innovations--which is why it was not needed to reflect on the deeper systemic causes. Such terms as natural capital, green growth, net-zero were frequently used to support exploitative paradigms in the name of environmental care. Conversely, indigenous language systems, like that of the Kogi and Māori, showed how it is possible to grammatize and narrate ecological ethics, conceptualizing the

environment not as a resource, but as a relative. Such eco-linguistic practices of indigenous peoples provide strong alternatives to dominant discourse, focusing on reciprocity, kinship, and ecological accountability as a whole. The juxtaposition provides an essential point of linguistic change in the discourses of the environment, in which a commodification of nature is replaced by the sense of interdependence and mutual care. Language is not only a passive embodiment of ecological values, as the findings demonstrate, but a powerful anthropocentric, ethical and policy change agent.

Recommendations

1. Integrate eco-linguistic principles into environmental education curricula at all levels to foster students' awareness of how language shapes ecological understanding, behaviors, and ethical perspectives.

2. Promote and preserve indigenous languages through educational policies and community-led revitalization programs, recognizing them as vital repositories of ecological knowledge and sustainable worldviews.

3. Encourage policy makers, educators, and media professionals to adopt language that reflects ecological interdependence, mutual care, and the rights of non-human entities, moving beyond anthropocentric and technocratic frames.

4. Conduct linguistic audits of corporate sustainability reports, advertising materials, and governmental environmental policies to identify instances of greenwashing, euphemism, and ideological framing that obscure ecological harm.

5. Develop training modules and workshops for journalists, communicators, and public relations professionals on responsible environmental language use, emphasizing metaphor choice, framing, and ethical storytelling.

6. Support the development of multilingual ecological communication strategies, especially in culturally diverse and linguistically rich regions, to ensure inclusivity and the transmission of localized environmental knowledge.

7. Incorporate positive discourse analysis into environmental campaigns and education to spotlight and disseminate language that inspires ecological responsibility, empathy, and collective action.

8. Encourage the use of relational and restorative terminology in public communication (e.g., "regeneration" instead of "mitigation," "kinship" instead of "resources") to reframe how society conceptualizes and interacts with nature.

Implications for Future Research

In continuation of the findings and methodological reflections of the present research, subsequent studies can complement it in its ambitions and scope of eco-linguistics using quantitative and multidisciplinary research frameworks, especially within education. Although

this paper focuses on qualitative analysis, future research can be a study that is longitudinal or based on an experiment to determine the real effects of the use of eco-linguistic intervention to the environmental attitudes and language habits of the learners. In other words, it is possible to conduct controlled studies in the classroom to determine the impact of exposure to ecocentric metaphors or indigenous narratives on ecological reasoning, vocabulary development, and behavioral intentions among students. This form of research would especially come in handy in a multilingual school setting where language policy and environmental education are complementary. Moreover, comparative analysis of curricula in other national settings might also reveal information about the manner in which the eco-linguistic principles are (not) being integrated elsewhere around the world, which could be used to base more effective policy suggestions.

No less significant is the necessity to increase the range of linguistic and cultural scope of inquiry of eco-linguistics. Contemporary studies are more likely to concentrate on English or other world languages, thus, leaving unstudied small eco-discourses through minor indigenous, minor, or even dying languages. It may be interesting to investigate in the future how environmental ethics are linguistically coded in less-taught languages (in particular, languages spoken in biodiverse or ecologically vulnerable hot-spots). This would not only add more depth to the eco-linguistic theory but will also add to the language preservation activities. Besides that, current developments in natural language processing (NLP) and artificial intelligence (AI) provide new efficient means of eco-linguistic analysis on the large scale. Machine learning models could help researchers identify metaphor patterns, erasure tactics, and ideological frames at scale, in a media archive, governmental reports, or social media discussions. By combining AI-driven discourse analysis with human interpretive procedures, one would have a hybrid approach that can be both in a large scale and in-depth. Such technological advancements present an opportunity to monitor discourse on the environment in real time, which can be used in academic research as well as in communication strategies. Taken together, these trends point towards the possibility of a more empirical, inclusive and digitally advanced future of eco-linguistics, which holds a lot of potential to change the way humanity talks, and interacts with the natural world, as well as ultimately protect it.

Limitations

Although this study does provide useful information on the importance of language in the process of forming of ecological thought and the communication process, it is not without shortcomings. The generalizability of findings is limited by the nature of the case studies, which revolve around a small number of corporate sustainability reports, two communities of indigenous language (Kogi and M2ori) and a restricted sample of English-language media, in its nature. It is a depth-oriented analysis that can be theoretically justified by relying on the qualitative studies rationale but can still fail to encompass the range of eco-discourses that existed in other cultural/institutional settings. Also, the interpretive attitude of learning in qualitative discourse analysis implies a certain level of subjectivity because conclusions may be influenced by the researcher and approach as well as the theoretical perspectives used. Though this is countered by the triangulation with both corpus linguistics and use of ethnographic interviews, the results are still dependent on the context. Moreover, the research presented the

problem of having access to indigenous oral traditions and their translation. Most ecological knowledge in these communities can be found in non-written sources of songs, ritual and oral narratives that are hard to capture adequately using written analysis and more likely to lose original meaning when transferred into the major academic languages.

References

Bolanle, A. S. (2024). *Eco-linguistics: Understanding the intersection between language, environment, and business*. Journal of Environmental Communication Studies, 12(1), 34–51.

Cameron, L., & Maslen, R. (2010). *Metaphor analysis: Research practice in applied linguistics, social sciences and the humanities*. Equinox.

Capra, F., & Luisi, P. L. (2014). *The systems view of life: A unifying vision*. Cambridge University Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. University Park Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1990). *New ways of meaning: The challenge to applied linguistics*. AILA Review, 6, 7–16.

Halliday, M. A. K. (2003). On the "architecture" of human language. In J. J. Webster (Ed.), *On language and linguistics* (Vol. 3, pp. 1–32). Continuum.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd ed.). Arnold.

Harré, R., Brockmeier, J., & Mühlhäusler, P. (1999). *Greenspeak: A study of environmental discourse*. Sage.

Hu, H., Luo, J., & Xu, L. (2024). The new ecolinguistics: Languaging, ecosystems, and sustainable discourse. *Applied Linguistics and Sustainability*, 5(1), 12–33.

Kazazoglu, S. (2025). Environmental education through eco-literacy: Integrating sustainability into English language teaching. *Sustainability*, 17(5), 2156.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors we live by* (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press.

Matthiessen, C. M. I. M., & Law, L. L. (2022). Revisiting Halliday (1990): The role of linguistics in sustainability discourse. *Conference Proceedings*.

Orr, D. W. (2004). *Earth in mind: On education, environment, and the human prospect* (10th anniversary ed.). Island Press.

Saeed, F., & Abid, H. (2025). Reframing climate narratives: A critical ecolinguistic analysis of Pakistani government discourse. *Linguistic Forum*, 7(1).

Sakaji, H., & Kaneda, N. (2024). Indexing and visualization of climate change narratives using BERT and causal extraction. *arXiv preprint*.

Steffensen, S. V., & Fill, A. (2019). Ecolinguistics: The state of the art and future horizons. *Language Sciences*, 41, 6–25.

Stibbe, A. (2015). *Ecolinguistics: Language, ecology and the stories we live by*. Routledge.

Stibbe, A. (2021). *Econarrative: Ethics, ecology and the search for new narratives to live by*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Stretton, J. (2024). Misframing sustainability: The linguistic ambiguity of environmental policy terminology. *Journal of Ecological Discourse*, 9(1), 45–61.

Williamson, T., Clarke, S., & Modi, N. (2024). Anthropocene narratives and the politics of environmental discourse. *Environmental Humanities Review*, 16(2), 88–104.

Zhou, W. (2022). Ecolinguistics: A half-century overview. *Journal of World Languages*, 7(3), 461–486.